



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ST. PAUL AND THE PRIESTS.

To those of our Roman Catholic friends who are in the habit of declining all inquiry upon religious matters, and prefer to submit implicitly to the guidance of their spiritual advisers, we would earnestly recommend the attentive consideration of the life of one whom they, in common with us, regard as one of the noblest of Christian heroes, and whose conversion to the true faith is specially commemorated by their Church about the present season.*

Many, perhaps, are in the habit of regarding St. Paul before his conversion as a blood-thirsty and ferocious bigot, hating God and all religion, and holding no feelings in common with any who bear the name of Christians; but a very slight examination will be sufficient to show that this cannot be a just view of the case. St. Paul was never without an earnest regard for religion; at no time was he an infidel, a vicious or even a thoughtless man; he was from his infancy a member of the divinely established Jewish Church, "circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin" (Philipp. 3, 5). In his youth he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts, 23, 3) an universally esteemed and honoured doctor of the law (Acts 5, 34) and carefully instructed in the rules and observances of the Jewish fathers (Acts 22, 3). Unlike many young men, he took a deep and thorough interest in the religious instruction he received, and became, as he tells us, "exceedingly zealous for the traditions of the fathers" (Gal. 1, 14) and the time-honoured institutions of the Jewish Church. The Christian doctrine he regarded as a new religion which would change these institutions (Acts 6, 14) or bring them into disrepute, and he was conscientiously persuaded that it was his bounden duty to oppose and destroy this heretical and upstart system. "He verily thought with himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts 26, 9). Samuel did God service by hewing Agag in pieces (1 Sam. 15, 32) and Elijah by slaying the priests of Baal (1 Kings 18, 40), and so Saul believed that it was right for him to persecute even unto death the teachers of doctrines which seemed to him false and hurtful, and in this belief he was confirmed by those who ought to have known better—his religious teachers and advisers, the rulers of the Jewish Church. He set out on his memorable journey to Damascus armed with full ecclesiastical authority, having received letters from the High Priest and all the estate of the elders, that if he found there any of that way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem to be punished (see Acts 22, 5; 9, 2; and 26, 10 and 12).^b

Here, then, we have the character of the unconverted Saul, and it is well worthy of our earnest consideration. In him we have a man of eminent talents (as his writings abundantly testify), highly educated, for the age in which he lived; earnest, conscientious, entirely above the influence of those low and vulgar vices by which so many are enslaved, zealous for what he believed the cause of truth and the honour of the Church of God, devoting himself, we may say, to the service of religion, and acting not upon his own individual responsibility, but with the sanction and concurrence of his spiritual advisers, and he is remembered, who held a divine commission and were descended in unbroken succession from a High Priest appointed by the Lord Himself; and yet this very man, with all his talent, and knowledge of Scripture, and earnestness, and advantages, was utterly ignorant of the true way to please God; and while he thought he was engaged in a good work, he was really guilty of what all Roman Catholics and Christians of every class would agree in condemning as a most execrable crime.

And whence this strange religious darkness?

Paul's error arose from his bringing a prejudiced and unfair mind to the consideration of divine truth. There were some things about the religion of Jesus which he disliked, and he would listen to no argument in its favour. It seemed to lower the dignity of the Jewish Church. Instead of maintaining the importance and perpetuity of the rites and customs ordained by Moses, it regarded them as institutions, useful, indeed, for a time, but which had done their work and were no longer necessary. Instead of proclaiming a future glorious Messiah, who was to conquer all the enemies of Israel and restore them to freedom and exalt them above all the nations of the earth, it declared that the Son of God had appeared on earth as a man of humble

* These lines were written for our February number, but were unavoidably postponed from want of room.

^b It is surely not without some purpose that it has been repeated no less than four times in the inspired history that he set out on his journey to Damascus to persecute the Christians with the concurrence and authority of the High Priest.

^c If that frequently quoted promise of our Lord to his Apostle "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Mat. 28, 20) meant that the teachers of his Church in every age would possess the gift of infallibility, and that following their directions and advice would be the only sure way of being led to the truth, it would follow (interpreting the Old Testament on the same principles) that St. Paul was in the right when he persecuted Christ, and that his error lay in becoming a Christian, because similar promises of God's perpetual presence were frequently given to the Jewish Church. See e. g., Deut. 31, 6 and 8; Isaiah 41, 10, and 43, 5, &c. Does not this clearly prove that the principle, adopted by so many of our fellow-countrymen, of following, in all religious matters blindly and without examination, the advice and direction of their spiritual advisers, is a principle wholly destructive of all Christianity? Had the Jews all adopted it none of them would have followed Christ. Had Paul acted on it, he would never have become a Christian.

station, and been crucified as a malefactor at the instigation of those very priests who ought to have been the first to acknowledge and welcome him. Had he patiently listened to and candidly considered St. Stephen's exposition of the Scriptures, and the arguments of the other Christian teachers, he would have learned that his prejudices were unfounded, that Christianity instead of dishonouring the Jew's religion was its perfection and its end, "witnessed both by the law and the prophets" (Rom. 3, 21); and he would have been withheld from the commission of crimes, the thoughts of which, till the day of his death, filled him with remorse. But he would listen patiently to nothing. He scrupulously avoided all inquiry. What need was there for him to reason or argue out of Scripture when he had the anointed priests of God, the true interpreters of Scripture, upon his side? What need of argument or controversy to put down a system of belief which had sprung up but a few years ago, and whose recent origin was its sufficient condemnation. It seemed a much easier and simpler plan to put to death any Christians he could find, or to shut them up in prison; and this was the course approved of by the priests. Stephen and the Christians reasoned out of the Scriptures. Paul and the priests persecuted and threatened. Stephen, the martyr, studied, and quoted, and followed the written Word. Paul, the persecutor, submitted wholly to the authority of his appointed teachers and the rulers of the Jewish Church. Paul, indeed, became a great controversialist. Some of his epistles (that to the Galatians for example) are almost wholly controversial. His manner was, we read in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 17, 2), to reason out of the Scriptures. But this was after he became a convert to the faith of Christ. Before his conversion we look in vain for a single argument against what he considered heresy. He "breathed out" only "threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord."

But, not to weary our readers by carrying out this subject to too great length, there are four points connected with St. Paul's history to which we would solicit their earnest attention.

1st. That while before his conversion he never seems to have used any arguments in support of his opinions, it was his custom afterwards to "give reasons of the hope that was in him" (Acts 17, 2 and 17; 16, 13, &c., &c.)

2nd. That while before his conversion he seems implicitly to have followed the teaching of his spiritual advisers, he afterwards recognized the higher duty of comparing their injunctions with the revealed will of God, "not conferring with flesh and blood" only (Gal. 1, 16), but seeking by earnest prayer for instruction and guidance from on high (Acts 9, 11).

3rd. That after his conversion he was called a heretic by those who regarded themselves as members of the only true Church (Acts 24, 5, and 14).

4th. That while before his conversion he was "exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers" (Gal. 1, 14), he afterwards made the written word his rule of faith, "Believing all things that were written in the law and in the prophets" (Acts 24, 14).

Whether St. Paul's principles after his conversion resembled more those of the Romish or the Reformed Church, we leave it for any candid and well-informed Christian to decide; for ourselves we believe that there would be but little difference among honest and fair-minded men upon religious questions, if they could only be brought patiently and earnestly, without prejudice or party spirit, and in dependence upon that heavenly teaching which is promised to all who truly seek it, to endeavour to ascertain the revealed will of God; and it is our earnest prayer for ourselves, and our Roman Catholic friends, that we may be enabled thus in a right spirit to seek for truth, and to follow the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2nd Cor. 10, 5).

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY, IN CONNECTION WITH THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

The Church of Rome has never formally defined the seat of infallibility. The opinions of her doctors have been divided on this point. Some have placed it in the Church Diffusive—i. e., the whole body of the faithful scattered throughout the world. Some in the Church Representative—i. e., in the whole body of the Episcopate. Some, again, regard the Decrees of a General Council as infallible. Some require that these Decrees should be confirmed by the Pope. Whilst some, lastly, maintain that the Pope himself, when speaking *ex cathedra*, is infallible on all questions of faith and morals. This last is the ultramontane theory. It has gradually displaced all rival theories, and is now acquiesced in by all Romanists, with the exception of the few who still struggle to maintain the nearly extinct principles of Gallicanism. The promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by the present Pope, Pius IX., on the 8th of December, 1854, was the crowning point and triumph of the ultramontane theory. The personal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was implied, if not asserted, in the bull by which that dogma was enjoined. The Bishops who were present at the promulgation of the dogma had nothing to do with it. Neither they, nor

the other Bishops to whom the Pope had written a circular, with the view of consulting them on the matter, contributed a particle of authority to the dogma. That this is so, we have the evidence of one of the most zealous partisans of the new dogma, Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, who has written a bulky volume of more than eight hundred pages, chiefly to prove that Pius IX. pronounced the definition of the 8th of December on his own authority, and independent of the Bishops.^a This being so, it may be useful to inquire how far the past history of the Church of Rome countenances the notion of the personal infallibility of the Pope. And if it should appear, upon a review of that history, that many Popes have erred in questions of faith; and, moreover, that all of them, up to a comparatively recent period, seem to have been utterly ignorant of their possessing the attribute of infallibility; it may well raise grave doubts in the mind of every reflecting Roman Catholic as to the binding authority of that Decree which raised the opinion respecting the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin to the rank of a doctrine *de fide*.

The following examples of fallibility and actual error on the part of the Bishops of Rome, in matters relating to faith, are well known, and have—most of them, at least—been already noticed in our pages:—

1. Tertullian (*adv. Praxeam*, c. 1) speaks of a Bishop of Rome who fell into error by officially approving the heresy of Montanus. This Pope is supposed to have been Eleutherius (A. D. 177-192), a saint in the Roman Calendar. He subsequently revoked the approbation so bestowed; but by doing so admitted his fallibility.

2. Pope Liberius (A. D. 352-366), in consequence of his vigorous resistance to Arianism, was banished to Bergea, in Thrace. But at the end of two years' exile he was induced to adopt that heresy. He approved and received as Catholic the Arian confession or symbol set forth by the Council of Sirmium; and signed, moreover, the condemnation of Athanasius, the great champion of Catholic truth.

3. Pope Innocent I. (A. D. 402-417), acting as Pope, solemnly condemned one of the bishops of Macedonia, Photinus by name. The Pope subsequently admitted that he had been mistaken, and revoked the sentence of condemnation. He did not believe that the Papal decrees were infallible. Innocent is a saint in the Roman Calendar.

4. Pope Zozimus (A. D. 417-18), also a saint, after having, along with his clergy, examined the heretical writings of Pelagius, pronounced them orthodox, and their doctrine true and Catholic, in a solemn letter addressed to all the bishops of Africa. This same Pelagius had been condemned as a heretic by Zozimus's predecessor, Innocent I. So that, not only did Zozimus himself fall into error, but, by reversing a doctrinal decision of his predecessor, he showed that he did not believe in the doctrine of papal infallibility. Augustine and Prosper frequently refer to the error of the Papal See in this matter, and thereby plainly show that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was equally unknown to them.

5. Pope Vigilius (A. D. 540-55) changed his opinion several times respecting the "Three Chapters." He first approved, and finally condemned them. His own words are, "As to what has been done by me in favour of these Three Chapters, and in defence of them, we revoke and annul it by our present decree." Vigilius, then, did not believe in his own infallibility. One of his successors (Pelagius II.) excused the error of Vigilius by saying that the latter did not well understand the nature of the writings in question, because of his imperfect knowledge of Greek! A curious apology for an infallible Judge of controversy. However, in making such an apology, Pelagius, of course, shows that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was unknown to him.

6. Pope Honorius I. (A. D. 625-38) fell into the heresy of the Monothelites, and was solemnly condemned as a heretic by two of his successors, Leo II. and Adrian II., and by no less than three General Councils. The following are the words of Pope Leo II. (in his letter to Constantine Pogonatus):—"We anathematize the inventors of this new error, Theodore, Cyrus, and Sergius, and with them Honorius, who, so far from governing the Apostolic Church according to the doctrine of the Apostles, was compelled, by a profane treachery, to ruin the purity of the faith." Pope Adrian's letter to the Fathers of the Eighth General Council contains the remarkable statement, that "heresy is the only crime for which it is permitted to inferiors to resist a Pope;" thus clearly admitting that such a crime is one which other Popes besides Honorius might be guilty of. Neither Pope Leo II., nor Adrian II., nor the Sixth, Seventh, or Eighth General Councils were aware that infallibility belonged to the Pope.

7. After the death of Pope Formosus (A. D. 896), his next successor but one, Pope Stephen VII. (or, according to some, VI.), assembled a Council, and caused the body of Formosus to be disinterred and thrown into the Tiber. Moreover, Stephen in council decided that Formosus' ordinations were invalid, and re-ordained several. Pope Theodorus II., who came next but one after Stephen, annulled the decree of the latter, and recognised as valid the orders of those whom Stephen had declared to be not ordained. Theodorus' acts were ratified by his successor, Pope John IX. On the other hand, not long after, Pope Sergius III. (A. D. 904-11) pronounced in favour of Stephen, and declared the ordinations of Formosus to be null and void. Thus, then, we have two Popes, Stephen and Sergius, in direct opposition to two others, John and Theodorus, and that, too, on a most important question, in which the well-being of the Church for ages was concerned—the validity of certain ordinations. It is perfectly plain that neither party in this memorable dispute could have regarded the other as invested with an infallible judgment.

8. Pope Gregory VII. (1073-85), notwithstanding the exalted opinion which he held of the prerogatives of the Papal See, believed neither his own infallibility nor that of

^a *La Croissance Generale*, &c., par l'Eme. et Rme. Cardinal Gousset, Archeveque de Rheims.

his predecessors. In a letter addressed to the Bishop of Autun (Ep. 31, Lib. 9), he admits that he might be surprised into error, adding, "We prefer to correct our mistake, in accordance with your desire, rather than to deviate from justice and right reason." A Pope who admits that he may be entrapped into a decision contrary to justice and right reason could have had but a faint notion, if any, of his own infallibility. And as to his predecessors, Gregory states in another of his letters that it was his duty to correct their errors.

9. Pope Paschal II. (1099-1118), being suspected of heresy by the Council of Lateran in 1112, made, in full council, a profession of his faith, in order to allay that suspicion. This Roman Council, composed of more than 100 Bishops, did not believe that the Pope was incapable of error.

10. Pope Innocent III. (1198-1216), one of the ablest Pontiffs who ever occupied the papal chair, has, in the clearest manner, condemned the ultramontane notion of the infallibility of the Pope, in the following passages:—"Although in the case of all other sins I have God alone for my judge, I might be judged by the Church for a sin against the faith" (2 Serm. de Consecr. Pontif.). "The Church of Rome might repudiate the Pope for spiritual fornication; that is to say, might repudiate him because of an error against the faith" (3 Serm. de Consecr. Pontif.).

11. Pope Clement IV. (1264-68) confesses that his predecessors had to reproach themselves with acts contrary to human and divine law, and that he might justly abolish these acts. (Clam. IV., Epist. ad abb., Case-Dei.) He knew nothing of papal infallibility.

12. Pope Nicholas III. (1277-80) condemned in the Bull *Erat qui seminavit* the opinion of the Franciscans, that our Lord possessed a property in anything of which he made use. This Bull was confirmed by Popes Martin IV., Nicholas IV., and Clement V. But, not long after, in 1323, Pope John XXII. issued the Bull *Cum inter nonnullos*, in which he branded as enormous and heretical the doctrine taught by his four predecessors. The following year he published another bull, in which he declared that doctrine to be a pernicious heresy and a blasphemy against the Catholic faith. We need not inquire whether he or they were in the right. Two things are certain, firstly, that he did not believe in papal infallibility; secondly, that either he or they actually erred.

13. The Pope just mentioned, John XXII. (1316-34), himself propounded a dogma which he subsequently retracted as erroneous and contrary to the Catholic faith, viz., asserting that the Beatific Vision did not take place till after the final judgment.

14. Pope Boniface VIII. (1294-1304), in his famous Bull *Unam sanctam*, declared it to be *de fide* that the Roman Pontiff possessed universal temporal sovereignty *de jure divino*. Pope Clement V. annulled that Bull by the Bull *Meruit*; and, moreover, he annulled by another bull Boniface's celebrated Bull *Clericis laicos*. As before, two conclusions follow inevitably from this—First, that Clement did not believe in the infallibility of his predecessor; secondly, that one of the two must have been in error.

15. Pope Gregory XI. (1370-78) solemnly revoked, in his last will and testament, "all erroneous opinions contrary to the Catholic faith to which he might have given utterance, whether in Consistory or in Council." This Pontiff believed that a Pope, even in Consistory or Council, might err against the faith.

16. Pope Eugenius IV. (1431-47), in his struggles against the Council of Basle, maintained that he was superior to the Council; but he afterwards humbly admitted his error, and revoked in his Bull *Dudum* the Bulls which he had previously published. He also recognised the acts of the Council up to that date—viz., the sixteenth session. Now, it was previous to that session that the Council had decreed the fallibility of the Pope, and that the prerogative of infallibility belonged to the Church alone, composed of all the faithful as well as the head. Eugenius IV. thus acknowledged his own fallibility, by retracting his former claims; and he, moreover, assented to the statement that the dogma of Papal infallibility is an error.

Pope Nicholas V., also, in his Constitution, published in 1449, again annulled whatever he and Eugenius IV. had done in opposition to the Council of Basle, and acknowledged its Decrees to be valid up to the date of his Constitution. Here we have two Popes proclaiming themselves fallible, and openly condemning the ultramontane theory of the infallibility of the Pope.

17. Pope Pius II. (1458-64), when Eneas Sylvius, openly taught the doctrine of the Council of Basle—viz., that a Pope may err. It is true that after his elevation to the Papal throne he retracted that opinion; but we may well doubt whether his real convictions were altered. At all events, he was one of the most learned theologians of the age, and his first decision against the infallibility of the Pope must be regarded as a most important testimony against the modern ultramontane notion.

18. Pope Adrian VI. (1522-3) openly professed, and that too as Pope, the doctrine of the Gallican Church respecting the fallibility of the Popes. When Professor at the University of Louvain, he published a commentary on the 4th Book of the *Sentences*, in which he expressed himself plainly on this point. His opinions though well known, did not prevent his elevation to the Papedom. When Pontiff, he reprinted his commentary, in which we read the following passage:—"If by the Roman Church be meant its head, the Pope, it is certain that he may err, even in things relating to faith, by broaching some heresy in his Constitutions or Decretals; for several of the Roman Pontiffs have been heretics" (Tract. de Sac. Confirm., art. 3). In proof of this position, he refers to the bull of John XXII., respecting the Beatific Vision, above noticed.

19. If there be an important point in theology, it certainly is that regarding the integrity of the text of the Holy Scriptures. If two Popes are found contradicting each other on this fundamental point, one of them must be erring in a way inconsistent with infallibility. Now Pope Sixtus V. (1585-90), published an edition of the Vulgate, which he declared to be

"true, legitimate, authentic, and undoubted." After his death, Clement VIII. published a new edition, differing in thousands of places from that of Sixtus. Which of these two editors was infallible?

20. On the question of grace it would be impossible to enumerate all the contradictory statements of Popes. During several ages, Bulls and Briefs innumerable were published respecting it, in which may be found semi-pelagianism so intermingled with Catholic truth, as to render it next to impossible to determine which of the two the writers meant to inculcate.

Even this brief review of the history of the Papacy serves to show, that not only were the Popes subject to error, while solemnly delivering their judgments respecting matters of faith, but that the notion of papal infallibility is wholly of modern growth. This unquestionable fact may well raise anxious doubts in the mind of any reflecting Roman Catholic, as to his obligation to receive as a Catholic verity, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, resting solely, as it does, on the fiat of the present Pontiff.

THE JANSENIST BISHOPS OF HOLLAND.

In our last number we were taken to task by an eminent Roman Catholic gentleman (who furnished us with his name, but forbade us to publish it) for having spoken incidentally in a former number of the Archbishop of Utrecht and Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer as belonging to the Jansenist party of the Roman Catholic Church in Holland. Our correspondent asserts that these Jansenist Bishops are improperly called a party of the Roman Catholic Church, and that they are merely dissenters from it, and have been so for nearly two hundred years.

Whether the Archbishop of Utrecht and his colleagues really ought to be called dissenters from the Church of Rome, as our correspondent asserts, or whether they deserve the name of Roman Catholics, as they themselves have always asserted, while they refuse to conform to some of the orders and decrees of the Pope unaided by a general council, may really be a matter of very little importance, and scarcely worth serious discussion in the pages of such a periodical as ours, which has long been, and is still, grappling with many of the most vital questions that have ever agitated the Christian world; but we are not sorry to have an opportunity of laying before our readers a few facts relative to this courageous and interesting body, from which they may be able to form their own opinion as to the real opinions and character of Jansenists in general.

In our article on the Nuns of Port Royal, in our number for November, 1854, we gave a brief account of the cruel persecution of those unfortunate victims of Jesuit bigotry, whose monastery was suppressed in 1709, under the authority of a Papal bull, not because they held or persevered in any heretical opinions, but merely because they steadily refused at all hazards to subscribe a test or formula, which was conceived in the following terms—"I condemn, from my inmost soul, and by word of mouth, the doctrine of the five propositions which are contained in the work of Cornelius Jansenius; a doctrine which is not that of St. Augustine, whose sentiments Jansenius has misinterpreted."

That the Papal denunciation against the Jansenists was not originally based upon persevering in matters of faith disapproved of by the Pope, is plain from this, that when the five propositions on the doctrines of divine grace, said to have been deduced from the "Augustinus" of Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, were condemned by Pope Innocent X., the leading Jansenists to a man, including Pascal, Arnauld, De Sacy, and other eminent men (the Bishop of Ypres himself had died fifteen years before), submissively bowed to the decision, and unanimously signed the paper prepared for them by the Jesuit Cornet, admitting the five propositions to be heretical; each, however, at the same time adding to his signature a denial that the propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius. The Pope promulgated a bull, which decreed that the five propositions were in the book; and at the bidding of the king the formula above given was drawn up, and ordered to be taken by all ecclesiastics and all religious communities, male and female, fortified, of course, by effective penalties. Thence originated the celebrated controversy about the distinction between infallibility in matters of faith and infallibility in matters of fact; the matter of faith being in this instance the justice of the Papal censure of the five propositions, which all Catholics, including the Jansenists themselves, admitted; the fact, being the existence in the "Augustinus" of the propositions so censured, which all Jansenists denied.

It was for declining to sign the formula so framed, which the Jansenists to a man refused to do, that that ruthless persecution ensued, which terminated only with the banishment of all living adherents of the school of Port Royal, and the disinterment from their very graves of the bones of Pascal, De Tillemont, Racine, and De Sacy, upon the destruction of their monastery, in October, 1709, by an armed force under the Marquis D'Argenson.

It was the Protestant country of Holland which afforded a refuge to the remnant of the persecuted and dispersed Jansenists. Their numbers in that country at the end of the seventeenth century were estimated at 330,000. Amongst them, many from France had settled. We have not space to trace their progress from that period. Suffice it to say, that upon the death of Archbishop Codde, who was appointed and consecrated in 1689, the Chapter of Utrecht

elected Cornelius Steenhoven, and the Chapter and Archbishop elect both wrote to the Pope to notify the appointment, and pray for his confirmation, to which letters, as well as two more subsequently sent, no answer was returned. After delaying a year and a-half, Archbishop Steenhoven was consecrated at Amsterdam, October 15, 1724, and notified to the Papal Court what had been done; which form has been regularly pursued ever since by the Archbishop's successors, showing that it is not in consequence of any desire of the Jansenist Bishops to separate themselves from the Church of Rome that briefs of excommunication were then and regularly since fulminated against them. Whether their protest against the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception (of which we give a copy in another column) may now draw a stronger line of demarcation between these Dutch Bishops and the Roman Church than existed prior to the 8th December, 1854, may, of course, be reasonably questioned; but prior to that memorable epoch, we think the Pope had no more right to treat the Bishops of Holland as dissenters from the Roman Catholic Church than he had to excommunicate the Cardinal of Lorraine and the whole of the French Church at the period of the Council of Trent, because they insisted upon their ecclesiastical independence of the Papal See, and stoutly maintained the Gallican liberties.

That up to the year 1827, Pope Leo XII. did not consider the Jansenist Bishops of Holland as separated from the Papal See by anything more important than their continued refusal to sign the formula which acknowledges the five propositions to be contained in the "Augustinus" of Jansenius, and to receive the bull "Unigenitus," which condemned the writings of Father Quesnel, may be collected from the following account of an interview with Archbishop Van Santen, in September, 1850, which we make no apology for transcribing from Dr. Tregelles' interesting book on the Jansenists (published by Baxter, London, in 1851), and which we think bears upon the face of it conclusive evidence of its accuracy and truth. It is given in page 82, &c., as follows:—

"Archbishop Van Santen gave me some curious accounts of the manner in which the authorities at Rome have from time to time endeavoured to induce the Jansenists to sign the formula which acknowledges the five propositions to be contained in the 'Augustinus' of Jansenius, and to receive the bull *Unigenitus*."

"These efforts seem, of late years, to have been especially made during the period when Holland and Belgium were united under one monarch. It was then regarded by Rome to be of especial importance fully to unite to herself all in the kingdom of the Netherlands who were not avowedly Protestants. About twenty-three years ago the Papal nuncio, Cappucini, a man of no small ability and address, came into the Netherlands with full authority to regulate everything for the consolidation of the Roman Catholic Church."

"Although the appointment of Archbishop Van Santen had been (as usual) followed by a renewed excommunication by Rome, yet Cappucini sought to win him just as if no such hostile step had been taken. He invited Archbishop Van Santen to a conference, with which he complied, as professing to accord to the Pope a disciplinary headship (at least in the Western Church), although he considered him to be in deep doctrinal error."

"In the first conference Cappucini sought to cajole Van Santen by much of that kind of smooth flattery which an Italian priest knows so well how to use. He spoke much of the unity of the Church; of the deep interest felt at Rome amongst the Papal authorities on account of the Jansenists; how they admired their firm adherence to the 'apostolical see,' in spite of all that had occurred in the last two centuries; how their steadfastness was only the more admirable in a country like Holland, with Protestants all around them; how firm a stand they had made against lax casuistry; and how much he hoped that no real difficulties might be found which would cause them to continue in any sense separated from the unity of the Catholic body."

"As to Archbishop Van Santen, personally, he was told by Cappucini how much his hopes rested on him, as a person so diligent in his attention to every canonical regulation—an attention shown (he said) in everything connected with his election, the notification to the holy see, his consecration, &c. In fact, the Pope would feel that he was quite an upholder of the authority of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands if the 'slight differences' could be arranged. Cappucini also spoke much of his personal qualities, his learning, character, and especially prudence, on which (he said) the Pope greatly relied as to the settlement and removal of every difficulty. Cappucini then appointed a time for another conference, which he hoped would be definitive."

"At the second conference Cappucini began by again praising Van Santen as a person of extreme 'regularity' and prudence. He then went on to say that all the differences between the Jansenists and the see of Rome might be reduced to one small point, one little thing about which a person of such prudence and regularity as the archbishop could, of course, make no difficulty. Van Santen perfectly understood what the nuncio meant by the 'one small point,' and he said, 'I see what you mean—the formula.' To this Cappucini was obliged to assent: the 'one small point' was that which had been the ground of such bitter persecutions and cruel sufferings."